DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 334 490 CG 023 505

AUTHOR Monthei, Carol
TITLE Important Factors That Influence Employers when Screening
PUB DATE 89
NOTE 80p.; Master of Education requirements, Colorado State University.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Dissertations/Theses - Undetermined (040)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Employer Attitudes; Employment Interviews; *Personnel Selection; *Resumes (Personal)

ABSTRACT

Little research has been done to substantiate the advice given by commercial writers of "self-help" books, and the research that has been done often arrives at conflicting results. This study examined resume preferences of personnel professionals (N=31). The personnel professionals, who represented major corporations, government agencies, and public schools, filled out a questionnaire regarding preferences for resume content, ratings of sample resumes' style and format, overall rating of resume style, and whether an applicant would be invited for an interview based on resume style. The results of the study indicated that the following factors were not used as criteria for screening applicants out of the hiring process: (1) omission of, or a low or average grade point average; (2) extensive education in an unrelated field; (3) prior employment length of less than one year; and (4) color of resume paper. Factors used to screen an applicant in for an interview were: directly related work experience (but not unrelated work experience); information in a related capabilities section; and information about awards, honors, and memberships. Misspelling and poor grammar, a resume of two pages or longer, and hand-writing the resume were factors that would usually screen the applicant out of the hiring process. (ABL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED334490

REPORT

IMPORTANT FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE EMPLOYERS WHEN SCREENING RESUMES

Submitted by

Carol Monthei

Schoool of Occupational
and
Educational Studies

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the Degree of Master of Education

in Vocational Education

Colorado State University

Fort Collins, Colorado

Spring 1989

CG023505

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Carol E. Monthei

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

COLORADO STATE UNIVERSITY

_____1989

WE HEREBY RECOMMEND THAT THE REPORT PREPARED UNDER OUR SUPERVISION BY CAROL MONTHEI ENTITLED IMPORTANT FACTORS THAT INFLUENCE EMPLOYERS WHEN SCREENING RESUMES BE ACCEPTED AS FULFILLING IN PART REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF EDUCATION IN VOCATIONAL EDUCATION.

Committee on Graduate Work

Adviser

Department Head

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page #

SIGNATURE PAGE. ii
LIST OF TABLES. iv
CHAPTER I 1
Introduction 1
Background. 1
Problem Statement 3
Objectives. 3
Need for the Study. 3
Definitions 4
CHAPTER II 6
Review of the Literature 6
Search Process. 6
Review of Previous Literature 6
Summary 14
CHAPTER III 15
Methodology. 15
Testing the Instrument. 15
Collection of the Data. 15
Analysis of Data. 16
CHAPTER IV 17
Findings 17
CHAPTER V 47
Summary, Conclusions, and Recommendations. 47
Summary 47
Conclusions 58
Recommendations 60
REFERENCES. 61
APPENDICES 63
Appendix A: Cover Letter. 64
Appendix B: Questionnaire 65
Appendix C: Sample Resumes. 73

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE #		Page #
1.	Job Objective.	18
2.	G.P.A.	18
3.	G.P.A.	19
4.	G.P.A.	20
5.	Education.	22
6.	Education.	22
7.	Work Experience.	23
8.	Work Experience.	24
9.	Employment History	25
10.	Employment History	26
11.	Employment Length.	28
12.	Honors, Awards, and Memberships.	29
13.	Honors, Awards, and Memberships.	30
14.	Interests.	31
15.	References	32
16.	Style.	33
17.	Spelling and Typographical Errors.	34
18.	Grammar.	34
19.	Resume Length.	36
20.	Handwritten Resume	38
21.	Paper Color.	38
22.	Paper Color.	39
23.	Paper Color.	40
24.	Cover Letter	40
25.	Related Capabilities Section	41
26.	Job Objective Style.	42
27.	Heading Style.	43
28.	Related Capabilities Style	43
29.	Employer Information and Job Title Style	44
30.	Dates of Employment Style.	44
31.	Reference Style.	45
32.	Over-all Preference.	45
33.	Interview Invitation	46

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

In the 1960s it was easy to get a job. Wenger (1986) described his experience in obtaining his first job during the 1960s. He learned of the position through a tip from a friend. He got the interview and the job without using an application form, resume, or cover letter. Many good jobs were available and employment was relatively easy to obtain.

This researcher had much the same experience as Wenger when she graduated in 1967 with a Bachelor of Science degree in Business Education and started job hunting in the rural area of central Iowa. She sent several letters announcing her availability in the job market to the nearby area schools, and several replied they had full-time positions open. One school immediately invited the researcher for an interview. Armed only with good intentions, she went to the interview and was offered a job on the spot; however, because of a new baby at home, she only wanted a part-time position. After several attempts by the administration to convince her she should take a full-time position, the administration created a half-time position in addition to the full-time opening, and she was hired. This anecdote is not meant to impress the reader with

the researcher's prowess, but rather to point out how easy it was in many areas to obtain a job in the 1960s.

In the past several years searching for and securing a job has become more and more competitive (Wenger, 1986; Goodman, 1984). In recent years it has not been uncommon for a single job opening advertised in a local paper to have resulted in more than 200 applications from job seekers (Longstreth, 1988).

As the job market tightened and the jobs available became more technical, the job seeker had to become more sophisticated in seeking employment. In this job seeking process, an important tool evolved to help bring the employer and employee together. That tool was the resume.

In the 1980s the resume has become an important step in the job hunt. It is the applicant's personal advertisement; shows his/her accomplishments, skills and competencies; tells the employer what the applicant wants to do; tells about the applicant as a person; and is an accurate resource for a prospective employer (Harkness, 1985). Perry (1985) stated, "A resume . . . is not a dull biography of your work history or a personalized list of job functions. It is an attention-getting advertisement of your abilities and accomplishments that should grab the employer's interest . . ." (p. 123). Almost everyone undervalues the resume in the beginning. They believe it is "merely a vehicle to transport credentials to a potential employer" (Rosen, 1985, p. 40). "Candidates with excellent potential do not reach the interview stage in a job

search for reasons that seldom have to do with 'politics.' In most cases, failure to be interviewed can be directly traced to the poor materials submitted for the initial screening" (Viering, 1987, p. 109).

Problem Statement

When reading a resume, what criteria does the employer use in deciding whether to extend the applicant an interview invitation?

Objectives

1. To identify what information the employer considers most important for a job seeker to include on a resume.
2. To determine at what point information the interviewer would like on the resume may screen the job seeker in/out if it is included/excluded.
3. To determine the importance resume format and writing style play in the screening process.

Need for the Study

Although commercial articles and self-help books abound, currently there is much confusion about what should be included on a resume, what an employer looks for in reading a resume, and what criteria the employer uses to screen the job applicant in or out. The advice given by the commercial "experts" is often confusing and conflicting. It is often said that resumes are used to eliminate people. If this is true, it is important to provide a resume that gives no reason

for being screened out and gives as many reasons as possible for being screened in (Goodman, 1984).

Little research has been done to support the advice given by such commercial writers of "self-help" books and articles (Ryland, 1987); and what research the researcher found often contained conflicting results. Because of the subjective nature of selecting applicants from resumes for interview invitations, it is the researcher's opinion that more research needs to be done to substantiate the advice being given to job seekers by commercial writers and classroom instructors.

Definitions

Resume: a written, condensed analysis or outline that is presented as a preliminary evaluation of the job seeker's qualifications (Heenan, 1985).

Functional Resume/ Skills Resume: Dates and positions are deemphasized. Qualifications, skills and accomplishments are emphasized. Organized in functional categories rather than presenting a complete work history (Ryland,1987).

Chronological or Traditional Resume: Dates and places of employment are listed in reverse chronological order. Focus is on work history and other pertinent information, such as education. (Ryland, 1987; Helwig, 1985).

Qualification Brief: Resume that is longer than the traditional with less distinctive headings. Underlining and parentheses are used extensively (Helwig, 1985).

Narrative Resume: Resume that is two pages, wordy, uses personal pronoun "I" extensively, underlines key ideas and actions, and contains more information on the job candidate (Helwig, 1985).

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

The literature reviewed was varied and covered many aspects of the job seeking search. The researcher focused on articles that solely addressed resume writing or articles that had a section about resume writing within a more encompassing subject, such as the steps to obtain an interview. The literature fell into two categories: (a) research studies that had been conducted regarding what aspects an employer considered important in a resume, and (b) commercially-written, self-help articles on resume writing targeted toward the general public.

Search Process

The resources available at Colorado State University's Morgan Library were used by the researcher to search the literature. Primary sources utilized were a computer search of Resources in Education (RIE), Current Index to Journals in Education (CIJE), a manual search of Education Index, and an Infotrac computer search of business publications.

Review of Previous Literature

Research. The researcher found three recent research studies which were conducted to determine employer preference

regarding resume content, writing style, format, etc. T. Mendenhall and J. Murphy (1984) conducted a study "...to determine through systematic evaluation those criteria important in characterizing applicants" (p. 86). The study was conducted by sending questionnaires to 400 personnel directors of organizations throughout the midwest which received a Keece School of Business and Economics student placement directory. The organizations surveyed represented both large and small companies that provided a variety of goods and services. The study resulted in 166 completed questionnaires being returned (41.5%). The researchers believed this was a sizable response and therefore concluded their data valuable and accurate.

A. Helwig (1985) surveyed corporate recruiters who visited two university campuses near Dallas, Texas. His research took a slightly different approach in that he provided the recruiters with resumes of the same fictitious applicant written in three different styles (traditional, qualification brief, and narrative) rather than using the questionnaire approach. The instructions requested that the recruiters review all three resumes before completing the questionnaire regarding their reactions to the different styles. Helwig's study received an 80 percent response rate, thereby giving the data strong substantiation.

The third research study conducted by E. Ryland, Rosen, and Benson (1987) concerned a larger issue than this researcher chooses to include in her study. However, the

study did include research on resume content, format, and writing style as a part of their study and therefore is a relevant study in the researcher's review of the literature. The researchers surveyed 660 personnel professionals chosen at random from the Directory of College Recruiting Personnel and from a membership roster of a national association of personnel administrators. Selection was achieved by randomly selecting a page in each of the two professional directories and then selecting every tenth name until 660 names had been selected. The researchers sent a cover letter together with a resume from a hypothetical job applicant. This study differed from the Helwig (1985) study in that each employer received only one resume to evaluate. The resumes were constructed on a 2 x 3 x 2 factorial design. The researchers of this study received a 35 percent return rate and were concerned whether their statistics were valuable because of the low return rate.

Mendenhall & Murphy (1984) concluded it was essential that the following be included on a resume:

1. career objective (88%)
2. major qualifications (97%)
3. schools attended (90%)
4. dates attended (82%)
5. degrees awarded (90%)
6. major (85%)
7. overall grade point (52%)
8. desired salary (52%)
9. dates of employment (95%)
10. places of employment (93%)
11. job responsibilities (88%)

The researcher is concerned with the results of #8 (desired salary). The results of this question prompted the

researcher to add an additional objective to her proposal--at what point does certain information the interviewer would like on the resume screen the job seeker out if it is included. Although it is true that the Mendenhall & Murphy (1984) survey was intended to ascertain what personnel directors wanted included on a resume, the researcher would like to remind the reader that the function of the resume is to get the applicant an interview (Goodman, 1984). The conclusion of Mendenhall & Murphy (1984) "...that it may provide a reference point to ascertain whether an applicant is too expensive or underpriced" (p. 93) indicates that inclusion of salary requirement on a resume may be used as a factor to screen out applicants.

Helwig (1985) concluded that although there was no statistical significance regarding the career objective, it was found that the short employment objective of the traditional style was least preferred, and the objective statement more preferred. The study concluded that in overall rating the traditional style (reverse chronological order) was preferred by a clear margin.

Ryland, Rosen & Benson (1987) found no evidence that employers preferred the chronological format over the functional format. This conclusion is in direct conflict with the conclusion reached by Mendenhall & Murphy (1984) where they concluded that employers definitely prefer the chronological style.

Commercial Articles. S. Anderson (1984) recommended a conceptual approach to resume writing. He explained there is an ambiguity in what the employer is seeking. Employers want their people to be "normal" yet "exceptional"--"fit in" yet "stand out." They want our genius, but keep it under control. E. Rosen (1988) wrote that content is the real challenge. The job applicant must provide information that shows he/she knows the score and knows where he/she is going.

The job objective is often discussed in commercial articles. D. Brinkerhoff and Smith (1986) and D. Allman (1987) told the reader that the resume must include a statement describing the position desired. C. Harkness (1985) supported Brinkerhoff, Smith, and Allman but also added that the job objective should be short (25 words or less) and specific. In contrast to this advice, E. Perry (1985) advised that the job objective may be left off the resume and instead be mentioned in the cover letter.

The question of whether to include personal experience and information is often debated in commercial publications. G. Rich (1987), N. Baxter (1987), and E. Heenen (1985) all advised against including personal information such as religious preference, photographs, and height, weight, etc. Brinkerhoff and Smith (1986) advised not to include personal information because the employer is hiring the applicant for his future, not his past. Allman (1987) quoted William Ball of Human Resources Group, a personnel consulting firm in Chicago. Ball discouraged using personal information such as

hobbies or marital status as some employers may come to an unfavorable conclusion. Anderson (1984) is in direct conflict with the authors mentioned earlier. He advised that job applicants give personal information on the resume to show their "normalcy." Harkness (1985) recognized the fact that the experts often disagree on the question of whether to include or leave out personal information. He pointed out that by including personal information the applicant runs the risk of being rejected; however, if the information is left out, the applicant may be rejected after the interview. Heenen (1985) and B. Nivens (1987) specifically advised against including salary objective or salary requirements.

The experience section of a resume is highly debated in commercial articles. E. Rosen (1988) advised that experience be listed in a reverse chronological order with the employer listed first followed by city, state, and years of employment. In direct contrast Harkness (1985) stated the applicant should list every job held, including volunteer work, with the job title first, followed by employer, dates, and a description of duties. Allman (1988) quoted William Ball, ". . . listing experience in order of importance to the position you want is the best way to coordinate your resume" (p. 20).

How long should the resume be? This question is often disagreed upon in the literature. Brinkerhoff and Smith (1986) wrote that anyone can write a one-page resume. They maintained, "Potential employers want a sketch of your background, not a detailed account of everything you've done

since you were born" (p. 37). D. Viering (1987) took the opposite view when he wrote that advice to keep the resume short is "out of step with the present. Depending on the length of the career, the resume should be two to three pages" (p. 111-112). Rosen (1988) took the middle ground. She advised that it is better to have two pages rather than reduce the print or leave out pertinent data. Harkness (1985) maintained a resume should be no more than two pages with one page being better.

Resume style is a controversial subject. N. Baxter (1987) stated that although a reverse chronological resume (traditional) is the easiest to compose, it is the least effective because it makes when you did something more important than how you did it. Harkness (1985), Nivens (1987), and Baxter (1987) advised that the traditional resume only be used when the job applicant's goal is to climb the career ladder in his/her present profession and/or when there has been no gaps in work history. Nivens (1987) and Baxter (1987) advised the use of a combination functional/chronological resume when changing careers. In this hybrid style, skills should be highlighted at the top and the bottom of the resume should contain a chronological work history. Brinkerhoff (1986) emphatically recommended a one-page functional resume. He wrote that it is the "ideal" form. In contrast, Goodman (1984), without reservation, advised the job applicant to use the reverse chronological format. Allman (1987) stated, "Ball says varied resume styles different from

the traditional chronological style 'generally are not well-accepted.' Ball cites the 'functional' resume as one that few employers like to see because they are so accustomed to the chronological style" (pg. 20). The researcher would like to point out that this quote is in conflict to the statement made by William Ball regarding the experience listing where he stated "...listing experience in order of importance to the position you want is the best way to coordinate your resume" (Allman, 1987, p. 20). Nivens (1987) and Rich (1987) stated that first impression was by far the most important. Rich (1987) indicated that resumes were screened out if they were handwritten or were not accompanied by a cover letter.

L. Walbert (1985) wrote an article that addressed gimmicks used to get employer's attention. The persons interviewed for this article had differing opinions regarding "off-the-wall" attention-getting devices. Robert Nesbitt, executive recruiter with Kern/Terry International stated he goes over the resume "with a fine-tooth comb if a 'cutesy' approach is used to get attention" (p. 240). He believes the applicant is trying to cover something. However, Hall Scutt, personnel director at Doyle Dane Bernback said, "I got one that was a shoe in a box with a note, 'I hope this gets my foot in the door.' I thought it was terrific. I'm going to see this guy" (p. 244). William McIlwain, director of personnel at Grey Advertising said, "it stirs interest, but it is the kind of interest you have in a side show. I think 90 percent of the weird and wonderful people are eliminated

where they might not be if they used a straight pitch" (p. 240).

Summary

Research regarding employer preferences for resumes was not abundant. What research had been conducted agreed in some areas but indicated direct conflict in several aspects (i.e. preferred format, or inclusion of salary requirements). The commercial articles advising job seekers what to include and to not include in preparing a resume were abundant. However, the articles gave conflicting advice in many important areas (i.e. content and format). None of the research the researcher read addressed the question of when or if giving certain information (i.e., G.P.A.) would be used to screen out the applicant and whether the applicant was screened out if such information was omitted. As the researcher noted earlier one publication gave conflicting advice within the same article. With so much conflicting information being published, the researcher believes more research is warranted to attempt to identify the criteria an employer uses in the resume screening process.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

Testing of the Instrument

The questionnaire was tested by persons involved in hiring procedures at both the vocational and professional level. The test group was asked to answer the questionnaire and indicate if any questions were unclear or needed to be revised or deleted. It was determined that no changes were needed.

Collection of the Data

The researcher collected data by attending the Colorado State University Career Fair held in Fort Collins, Colorado, and the KUSA Channel 9 Job Fair held in Denver, Colorado. The businesses at the fairs were represented by personnel professionals seeking to fill all levels of positions, ranging from entry-level vocational positions to positions requiring college graduate status.

The researcher randomly selected thirty-one personnel professionals who were attending career fairs as a means of recruiting job applicants. The personnel professionals represented major corporations, government agencies, and public schools. The researcher verbally explained the nature of her research project and then asked the personnel

professionals to read the accompanying cover letter (Appendix A), fill out the attached questionnaire (Appendix B) by referring to the sample resumes (Appendix C) attached to the questionnaire.

The participants in the survey were asked to fill out the questionnaires and either the researcher would pick them up later in the day or the completed questionnaires could be mailed to the researcher. As a result of the personal contact and the ability of many of the participants to complete the questionnaire immediately, 100 percent response was obtained.

The first part of the questionnaire asked questions about the preferences of employers regarding content of the resume. The second part of the questionnaire asked the participant to refer to the attached sample resumes and rate their preference regarding style and format. Finally the participants were asked to give an over-all rating of the three resume styles and also to indicate whether the applicant would be invited for an interview based on each of the resume styles.

Analysis of Data

The data obtained from the questionnaires were tabulated. The results of the tabulated material were transferred to tables and is presented in table form for ease of readability and analysis by the reader. Results of the survey are also discussed in a narrative form by the researcher.

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

The purpose of this chapter is to report the findings of the data obtained from the questionnaire. Thirty-one questionnaires were distributed in person. The questionnaires were either picked up in person by the researcher or the participants mailed the questionnaire to the researcher. As a result of the personal contact a 100 percent result was achieved.

The data in Table 1 indicate how likely the applicant would be screened out if the job objective was omitted from the resume. Two employers (6.45%) would definitely screen out, 7 employers (22.58%) would very likely screen out, 9 employers (29.03%) would seldom screen out, 6 employers (19.35%) would not screen out, and 7 employers (22.58%) would not consider the job objective in the screening process.

The data in Table 2, 3, and 4 indicate the importance the employer places on the G.P.A. Table 2 data indicate no employer (0%) would screen an applicant out if the G.P.A. was not included on the resume, 5 employers (16.13%) would very likely screen the applicant out, 11 (35.48%) would seldom screen the applicant out, 11 (35.48%) would not screen the applicant out, and 4 (12.90%) would not consider the exclusion of the G.P.A. in the screening process.

TABLE 1

Job Objective

Question 1: If the job objective is omitted from the resume, how likely are you to screen the applicant out?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	2	6.45
Very Likely to Screen OUT	7	22.58
Seldom Screens OUT	9	29.03
Will Not Screen OUT	6	19.35
Not Considered in the Screening Process	7	22.58
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

TABLE 2

G.P.A.

Question 2: If a job applicant does not include G.P.A. how likely are you to screen out the applicant?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	0	0.00
Very Likely to Screen OUT	5	16.13
Seldom Screens OUT	11	35.48
Will Not Screen OUT	11	35.48
Not Considered in the Screening Process	4	12.90
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

The data in Table 3 indicate the reaction of employers to a low G.P.A. (below a 3.0 on a 4.0 scale) included on the resume. One employer (3.23%) would definitely screen the applicant out, 6 employers (19.35%) would very likely screen the applicant out, 11 employers (35.48%) would seldom screen out, 10 employers (32.26%) would not screen out, and 3 employers (9.68%) would not consider the low G.P.A. in the screening process.

TABLE 3

G.P.A.

Question 3: If the job applicant includes G.P.A., and the G.P.A. is below a 3.0 on a 4.0 scale, how likely are you to screen the applicant out?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	1	3.23
Very Likely to Screen OUT	6	19.35
Seldom Screens OUT	11	35.48
Will Not Screen OUT	10	32.26
Not Considered in the Screening Process	3	9.68
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

The data in Table 4 reflect how the survey participants reacted if the applicant met all other qualifications for the position and an average or low G.P.A. was included on the resume but was explained (i.e., worked to finance education). Three employers (9.68%) would definitely screen the applicant in, 17 employers (54.84%) would very likely screen the

applicant in, 2 employers (6.45%) would seldom screen in, 1 employer (6.45%) would not screen in, and 8 (25.81%) would not consider an adequately explained average or low G.P.A. in the screening process.

TABLE 4

G.P.A.

Question 4: If the job applicant meets all other requirements of the position, how likely are you to screen the applicant in if an average or low G.P.A. is explained (i.e., worked to finance education)

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen IN	3	9.68
Very Likely to Screen IN	17	54.84
Seldom Screens IN	2	6.45
Will Not Screen IN	1	3.23
Not Considered in the Screening Process	8	25.81
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

It is important to note that only 16.13% would definitely or very likely screen the applicant out if the G.P.A. is omitted. The percentage of employers who would definitely or very likely screen out if a G.P.A. below 3.0 on a 4.0 scale was included on the resume rose to 22.58% (an increase of 6.45% chance of being screened out). However, if an average or low G.P.A. was included and adequately explained (and the candidate met all other requirements of the position), 64.52% would definitely or very likely screen the candidate in for

an interview based on the G.P.A. and the acceptable explanation.

It appears that leaving the G.P.A. off the resume is not a serious concern in the screening process. But if a low G.P.A. is included, the chances of being screened out are increased. The irony is that an adequately explained low or average G.P.A. highly increases the chances the candidate will be screened in based on this information.

The data in Table 5 relate to how an employer reacts to an overqualified job applicant. Two employers (6.45%) would definitely screen the applicant out if he/she was overqualified, 10 employers (32.26%) would very likely screen the candidate out, 10 employers (32.26%) would seldom screen out, 8 employers (25.81%) would not screen out, and 1 employer (3.23%) would not use overqualified education in the screening process.

The data in Table 6 reflect employer attitude toward a candidate who fulfills the requirements of the position but has extensive education in an unrelated field. No employer (9%) would definitely screen the applicant out, 5 employers (16.13%) would very likely screen the applicant out, 10 employers (32.26%) would seldom screen the applicant out, 15 employers (48.39%) would not screen the applicant out, and 1 employer (3.23%) would not consider extensive education in the screening process.

TABLE 5

Education

Question 5: How likely are you to screen out a job applicant who has more education than the position you are seeking to fill requires? (overqualified job applicant)

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	2	6.45
Very Likely to Screen OUT	10	32.26
Seldom Screens OUT	10	32.26
Will Not Screen OUT	8	25.81
Not Considered in the Screening Process	1	3.23
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

TABLE 6

Education

Question 6: How likely are you to screen out a job applicant who fulfills all the requirements for the position you are seeking to fill but has extensive education in an unrelated field?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	0	0.00
Very Likely to Screen OUT	5	16.13
Seldom Screens OUT	10	32.26
Will Not Screen OUT	15	48.39
Not Considered in the Screening Process	1	3.23
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

Data in Tables 7 through 11 reflect the importance employers place on work experience. Table 7 data show the weight survey participants placed on directly related work experience. Ten employers (32.26%) indicated they would definitely screen in applicants from information about directly related work experience, 13 employers (41.94%) would very likely screen the applicant in based on this section, 3 employers (9.68%) would seldom screen in, no employer (0%) would not screen in based on this information, and 5 employers (16.13%) would not consider extensive education in an unrelated field in the screening process.

TABLE 7

Work Experience

Question 7: How important is work experience directly related to the position you are seeking to fill in determining whether to screen the applicant in for an interview?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen IN	10	32.26
Very Likely to Screen IN	13	41.94
Seldom Screens IN	3	9.68
Will Not Screen IN	0	0.00
Not Considered in the Screening Process	5	16.13
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

Data in Table 8 indicate how employers view unrelated work experience of the candidate in relation to the screening process. No employer (0%) would definitely screen the applicant in based on unrelated work experience, 4 employers

(12.90%) would very likely screen the employee in, 17 employers (54.84%) would seldom screen in, 2 (6.45%) would not screen in based on this information, and seven (6.45%) would not consider unrelated work experience in the screening process. One employer (3.23%) did not respond to this question.

TABLE 8

Work Experience

Question 8: How important is work experience unrelated to the position you are seeking to fill in determining whether to screen the applicant in for an interview?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen IN	0	0.00
Very Likely to Screen IN	4	12.90
Seldom Screens IN	17	54.84
Will Not Screen IN	2	6.45
Not Considered in the Screening Process	7	22.58
No Response	1	3.23
TOTAL	31	100.00

Data in Table 9 and 10 deal with employer attitude regarding employment history gaps. Table 9 data indicate 2 employers (6.45%) will definitely screen the applicant out if there are gaps in employment history, 12 employers (38.71%) would likely screen the applicant out, 11 employers (35.48%) would seldom screen the applicant out, 3 employers (9.68%) would not screen the applicant out, and 3 employers (9.68%) would not consider employment gaps in the screening process.

TABLE 9

Employment History

Question 9:	How likely are you to screen out the job applicant if there are gaps in employment history?	
	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	2	6.45
Very Likely to Screen OUT	12	38.71
Seldom Screens OUT	11	35.48
Will Not Screen OUT	3	9.68
Not Considered in the Screening Process	3	9.68
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

Table 10 data address employer attitude toward a job applicant who meets all other job requirements, and who can legitimately explain gaps in employment history (i.e., volunteer work, raising family, etc.). Six employers (19.35%) would definitely screen the applicant in if gaps could be explained, 21 employers (67.74%) would very likely screen the applicant in, 1 employer (3.23%) would seldom screen in, 1 employer (3.23%) would not screen in, and 2 employers (6.45%) would not consider legitimately explained employment gaps in the screening process.

The reader should note the implication of the data revealed in Tables 9 and 10. Of the participants surveyed, 45.16% indicated they would definitely or very likely screen out an applicant who had employment gaps in the work history section of the resume. However, if work history gaps could

TABLE 10

Employment History

Question 10:	If there are gaps in the employment history but the applicant meet all other job requirements, how likely is it the job applicant will be screened in if the gaps re legitimately explained (i.e., volunteer work, raising family)?	
	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen IN	6	19.35
Very Likely to Screen IN	21	67.74
Seldom Screens IN	1	3.23
Will Not Screen IN	1	3.23
Not Considered in the Screening Process	2	6.45
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

be legitimately explained, 87.09% of the employers surveyed would definitely or very likely screen the applicant in. It appears that a job applicant with gaps in employment history can substantially increase his/her chances of surviving the screening process if he/she legitimately explains work history gaps. This would change the applicant's position from a 45.16% chance of being screened out to an 87.09% chance of being screened in.

Data in Table 11 deal with length of prior employment by the job applicant. Participants responded to a three-part question regarding prior employment of less than one year, one to two years, and two to three years as length of employment in prior positions by the job applicant. If the employment was less than one year, 2 employers (6.45%) would definitely

screen the applicant out, 8 employers (25.81%) would very likely screen out, 12 employers (38.71%) would seldom screen out, 4 employers (12.90%) would not screen out, and 4 employers (12.90%) would not consider length of employment in the screening process. One participant (3.23%) did not respond to this question.

If the prior employment was one to two years in length, 2 employers (6.45%) would definitely screen the applicant out, 3 employers (9.68%) would very likely screen out, 13 employers (41.94%) would seldom screen out, 8 employers (25.81%) would not screen out, and 3 employers (9.68%) would not use length of prior employment in the screening process. Two employers (6.45%) did not respond to this question.

When prior employment was of two to three years in length, no employer (0%) would definitely screen the applicant out, no employer (0%) would very likely screen out, 8 employers (25.81%) would seldom screen out, 18 employers (58.06%) would not screen out, and 3 employers (9.68%) would not consider length of employment in the screening process. Two participants (6.45%) did not respond to this question.

Table 12 and 13 indicate the reaction of the employer regarding honors, awards, and memberships. Table 12 data reflect how the employer views this section in the screening process. One employer (3.23%) would definitely screen out if the honors, awards, and memberships section was not included on the resume, no employer (0%) would very likely screen out if this section was omitted, 10 employers (32.26%) would if

TABLE 11

Employment Length

Question 11: How likely are you to screen out the job applicant if length of prior employment is short?

a. Less than one year.

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	2	6.45
Very Likely to Screen OUT	8	25.81
Seldom Screens OUT	12	38.71
Will Not Screen OUT	4	12.90
Not Considered in the Screening Process	4	12.90
No Response	1	3.23
TOTAL	31	100.00

b. One-two years

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	2	6.45
Very Likely to Screen OUT	3	9.68
Seldom Screens OUT	13	41.94
Will Not Screen OUT	8	25.81
Not Considered in the Screening Process	3	9.68
No Response	2	6.45
TOTAL	31	100.00

c. Two-three years

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	0	0.00
Very Likely to Screen OUT	0	0.00
Seldom Screens OUT	8	25.81
Will Not Screen OUT	18	58.06
Not Considered in the Screening Process	3	9.68
No Response	2	6.45
TOTAL	31	100.00

this section was omitted, 10 employers (32.26%) would seldom screen out, 15 employers (48.39%) would not screen out, and 5 employers (16.13%) would not use this section in the screening process.

TABLE 12

Honors, Awards, and Memberships

Question 12: How likely are you to screen out the applicant if this section is excluded from the resume?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	1	3.23
Very Likely to Screen OUT	0	0.00
Seldom Screens OUT	10	32.36
Will Not Screen OUT	15	48.39
Not Considered in the Screening Process	5	16.13
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

The data in Table 13 indicate how employers react to the information from the honors, awards, and memberships section when it is included on the resume. Three employers (9.68%) would definitely screen in based on the information found in the honors, awards, and membership section, 15 employers (48.39%) would very likely screen in, 4 employers (12.90%) would seldom screen in, 1 employer (3.23%) would not screen in, and 7 employers (22.58%) would not consider this information in the screening process. One participant did not reply to this question.

TABLE 13

Honors, Awards and Memberships

Question 13:	How likely are you to screen the applicant in from informtion provided in the honors, awards, or membership section.	
	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen IN	3	9.68
Very Likely to Screen IN	15	48.39
Seldom Screens IN	4	12.90
Will Not Screen IN	1	3.23
Not Considered in the Screening Process	7	22.58
No Response	1	3.23
TOTAL	31	100.00

The reader should note that, although only 3.23% of the participants surveyed would definitely or very likely screen out if the applicant left the honors, awards, and memberships section off the resume, 58.07% of the participants indicated they would definitely or very likely screen the applicant in based on information in this section. It appears the applicant can greatly increase his/her chances of being screened in for the interview if the honors, awards, and memberships section is included on the resume.

Data in Table 14 relate to how the employer values the interest section when screening the resume. One employer (3.23%) would definitely screen the applicant in based on information from the interest section, 6 employers (19.35%) would very likely screen the applicant in, 9 employers (29.03%) would seldom screen in based on this section,

1 employer (3.23%) would not screen in, and 13 employers (41.94%) would not consider the interests section in the screening process. One participant (3.23%) did to respond to this question.

TABLE 14

Interests

Question 14: How likely are you to screen the applicant in using information from the "interests" section?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen IN	1	3.23
Very Likely to Screen IN	6	19.35
Seldom Screens IN	9	29.03
Will Not Screen IN	1	3.23
Not Considered in the Screening Process	13	41.94
No Response	1	3.23
TOTAL	31	100.00

The reader should note that 22.58% of the employers surveyed would definitely or very likely screen an applicant in based on the interests section. Although this is not a large percentage, the researcher believes this section has not been viewed as very important by many job applicants. If 25% of the employers use this section to screen applicants into an interview, perhaps it warrants more attention.

Table 15 data reflect the participants' attitude regarding the reference section. No employer (0%) would definitely screen the applicant out if the reference section contained a statement "Available upon Request," 4 employers

(12.90%) would very likely screen the applicant out, 3 employers (9.68%) would seldom screen out, 14 employers (45.16%) would not screen the applicant out, and 10 employers (32.26%) do not consider the references section in the screening process.

TABLE 15

References

Question 15: How likely are you to screen the applicant out if "Available upon request" is used in the reference section?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	0	0.00
Very Likely to Screen OUT	4	12.90
Seldom Screens OUT	3	9.68
Will Not Screen OUT	14	45.16
Not Considered in the Screening Process	10	32.26
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

Data in Tables 16 through 22 regard employer emphasis on style, grammar, and format. Table 16 data show the attitude of employers on unfamiliar or unusual resume style. One employer (3.23%) would definitely screen the applicant out if an unusual or unfamiliar style was used, 6 employers (19.35%) would very likely screen out, 18 employers (58.06%) would seldom screen out, and 1 employer (3.23%) would not consider resume style in the screening process.

TABLE 16

Style

Question 16: How likely are you to screen the job applicant out if the resume style is unfamiliar or unusual?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	1	3.23
Very Likely to Screen OUT	6	19.35
Seldom Screens OUT	18	58.06
Will Not Screen OUT	5	16.13
Not Considered in the Screening Process	1	3.23
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

Data in Table 17 indicate the importance of correct spelling. Three employers (9.68%) would definitely screen the applicant out if the resume contained a typographical error or misspelled word, 15 employers (48.39%) would very likely screen out, 9 employers (29.03%) would seldom screen out, 2 employers (6.45%) would not screen out, and 1 employer (3.23%) would not consider typographical errors or misspelled words in the screening process. One participant did not respond to this question.

Data in Table 18 indicate how an employer views a resume with poor grammar. Eleven employers (35.48%) would definitely screen out an applicant that used poor grammar on the resume, 17 employers (54.84%) would very likely screen out, 2 employers (6.45) would seldom screen out, 1 employer (3.23%) would not screen out, and no employer (0%) would not consider grammar in the screening process.

TABLE 17

Spelling and Typographical Errors

Question 17: How likely are you to screen the job applicant out if the resume contains a misspelled word or typographical error?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	3	9.68
Very Likely to Screen OUT	15	48.39
Seldom Screens OUT	9	29.03
Will Not Screen OUT	2	6.45
Not Considered in the Screening Process	1	3.23
No Response	1	3.23
TOTAL	31	100.00

TABLE 18

Grammar

Question 18: How likely are you to screen the job applicant out if the resume contains poor grammar?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	11	35.48
Very Likely to Screen OUT	17	54.84
Seldom Screens OUT	2	6.45
Will Not Screen OUT	1	3.23
Not Considered in the Screening Process	0	0.00
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

The researcher would like the reader to note that 58.07% of the participants surveyed would definitely or very likely screen an applicant out if a misspelled word or typographical

error was detected. In addition, 90.32% of the participants indicated they would definitely or very likely screen out an applicant that used poor grammar on the resume. These percentages indicate that the proper use of grammar and spelling is highly important to the employer in the screening process.

Table 19 data indicate employer attitude regarding the length of the resume. If the resume was 1 1/2 to 2 pages no employer (0%) would definitely screen the applicant out, 3 employers (9.68%) would very likely screen out, 14 employers (45.16%) would seldom screen out, 10 employers (32.26%) would not screen out, and 4 employers (12.90%) would not consider the length of the resume in the screening process.

For a resume that was 2 to 2 1/2 pages in length, 4 employers (12.90%) would definitely screen the applicant out, 9 employers (29.03%) would very likely screen the applicant out, 8 employers (25.81%) would seldom screen out, 6 employers (19.35%) would not screen out, and 4 employers (12.90%) would not consider the length of the resume in the screening process.

If a resume was three pages in length, 7 employers (22.58%) would definitely screen the applicant out, 8 employers (25.81%) would very likely screen out, 7 employers (22.58%) would seldom screen out, 5 employers (16.13%) would not screen out, and 4 employers (12.90%) would not consider the length of the resume in the screening process.

TABLE 19

Resume Length

Question 19: How likely are you to screen the applicant out if the resume is more than one page in length?

a. 1 1/2 pages

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	0	0.00
Very Likely to Screen OUT	3	9.68
Seldom Screens OUT	14	45.16
Will Not Screen OUT	10	32.26
Not Considered in the Screening Process	4	12.90
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

b. 2 to 2 1/2 pages

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	4	12.90
Very Likely to Screen OUT	9	29.03
Seldom Screens OUT	8	25.81
Will Not Screen OUT	6	19.35
Not Considered in the Screening Process	4	12.90
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

c. 3 pages

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	7	22.58
Very Likely to Screen OUT	8	25.81
Seldom Screens OUT	7	22.58
Will Not Screen OUT	5	16.13
Not Considered in the Screening Process	4	12.90
No Response	2	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

It is important for the reader to note that the chances for being screened out based solely on the length of the resume increases sharply as the resume increases in length. While only 9.68% of the participants will definitely or very likely screen an applicant out if the resume is 1 1/2 to 2 pages in length, 41.93% of the employers will definitely or very likely screen out if the length of the resume is increased to 2 to 2 1/2 pages, 48.39% of the employers will definitely or very likely screen out if the resume increases to three pages. It appears to be very important that the applicant keep the resume to two pages or less.

The data in Table 20 indicate how employers view handwritten resumes. Nine employers (29.03%) would definitely screen out if the resume was handwritten, 11 employers (35.48%) would very likely screen out, 7 employers (22.58%) would seldom screen out, 3 employers (9.68%) would not screen out, and 1 employer (3.23%) would not consider the fact that the resume was handwritten in the screening process.

Data in Table 21 and 22 reveal employer attitude regarding a resume printed on colored paper. Table 21 data indicate whether an employer would screen the applicant in if colored paper was used. No employer (0%) would screen an applicant in based on the fact that it was printed on colored paper, 3 employers (9.68%) would very likely screen in, 3 employers (9.68%) would seldom screen in, no employer (0%) would not screen an applicant in because of paper color, and 25 employers (80.65%) would not consider paper color in the screening process.

TABLE 20

Handwritten Resume

Question 20: How likely are you to screen the job applicant out if the resume is handwritten?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	9	29.03
Very Likely to Screen OUT	11	35.48
Seldom Screens OUT	7	22.58
Will Not Screen OUT	3	9.68
Not Considered in the Screening Process	1	3.23
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

TABLE 21

Paper Color

Question 21: How likely are you to screen the job applicant in if the resume is on colored paper?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen IN	0	0.00
Very Likely to Screen IN	3	9.68
Seldom Screens IN	3	9.68
Will Not Screen IN	0	0.00
Not Considered in the Screening Process	25	80.65
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

Data in Table 22 indicate whether an employer would screen the applicant out because colored paper was used. One employer (3.23%) would definitely screen the applicant out if the resume was on colored paper, no employer (0%) would very

likely screen out, 5 employers (6.13%) would seldom screen out, 5 employers (12.90%) would not screen out, and 21 employers (67.74%) would not consider the fact that the resume was on colored paper in the screening process.

TABLE 22

Paper Color

Question 22: How likely are you to screen the job applicant out if the resume is on colored paper?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	1	3.23
Very Likely to Screen OUT	0	0.00
Seldom Screens OUT	5	16.13
Will Not Screen OUT	4	12.90
Not Considered in the Screening Process	21	67.74
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

Data in Table 23 relate to the employers' preference in paper color. Fourteen employers (45.16%) preferred ivory, 11 employers (35.48%) preferred white, and 5 employers (16.13%) had no color preference. One survey participant (3.23%) did not respond to this question.

Data in Table 24 indicate employer attitude regarding a cover letter accompanying the resume. One employer (3.23%) would definitely screen the applicant out if a cover letter did not accompany the resume, 8 employers (25.81%) would very likely screen out, 13 employers (41.94%) would seldom screen

TABLE 23

Paper Color

Question 23: Please list your 4 preferences for paper color with your most preferred color first.

	Number	Percent
First Choice		
Ivory	14	45.16
White	11	35.48
No Preference	5	16.13
No Response	1	3.23
TOTAL	31	100.00

out, 2 employers (6.45%) would not screen out, and 7 employers (22.58%) would not consider the fact that a cover letter did not accompany the resume.

TABLE 24

Cover Letter

Question 25: How likely are you to screen the applicant out if a cover letter does not accompany the resume?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen OUT	1	3.23
Very Likely to Screen OUT	8	25.81
Seldom Screens OUT	13	41.94
Will Not Screen OUT	2	6.45
Not Considered in the Screening Process	7	22.58
No Response	0	0.00
TOTAL	31	100.00

Data in Table 25 indicate the importance the employers placed on a "related capabilities" section of the resume. Three employers (9.68%) would definitely screen in on information provided in this section, 14 employers (45.16%) would very likely screen in, 7 employers (22.58%) would seldom screen in, 1 employer (3.23%) would not screen in, and 4 employers (12.90%) would not consider this section in the screening process. Two participants (6.45%) did not respond to this question.

TABLE 25

Related Capabilities Section

Question 29: How likely are you to screen the applicant in based on a "related capabilities" section?

	Number	Percent
Definitely Screen IN	3	9.68
Very Likely to Screen IN	14	45.16
Seldom Screens IN	7	22.58
Will Not Screen IN	1	3.23
Not Considered in the Screening Process	4	12.90
No Response	2	6.45
TOTAL	31	100.00

The information in Table 26 through 33 was compiled from the tabulated results of questions which asked the survey participants to refer to sample resumes of a potential job applicant (Appendix C). Sample A was a traditional, reverse chronological resume with side headings, dates at the left, and job titles underlined. Sample B was also a reverse

chronological resume, but the main headings were centered, a related capabilities section was included, and the employer name was underlined. Sample C was a functional resume with main headings blocked at the left and related information slightly indented, and major achievements were listed with the job title underlined. Work history was a separate section listing only the employers' name, address, and the applicant's job title, no employment dates were given, and references were included on the resume.

Table 26 data indicate the job objective style the survey participants preferred. Ten employers (32.26%) preferred Resume A, 14 employers (45.16%) preferred Resume B, and 6 employers (19.35%) preferred Resume C.

TABLE 26

Job Objective Style

Question 26: Please rank the most preferred job objective style in order of preference with your most preferred choice as number 1.

Raw Score				Percentage			
A	B	C	No Resp.	A	B	C	No Resp.
10	14	6	1	32.26	45.16	19.35	3.23

Table 27 data rank the sample resumes in regard to the most preferred heading style. Fifteen employers (48.39%) preferred Resume A, 13 employers (41.94%) preferred Resume B, and 3 employers (9.68%) preferred Resume C.

TABLE 27

Heading Style

Question 27:	Please rank the most preferred heading style in order of preference.						
Raw Score				Percentage			
A	B	C	No Resp.	A	B	C	No Resp.
15	13	3	0	48.39	41.94	9.68	0.00

Data in Table 28 show the result of survey participants' reaction to the style of a related capabilities section. Eleven employers (35.48%) preferred Resume A, 14 employers (45.16%) preferred Resume B, and 6 employers (19.35%) preferred Resume C.

TABLE 28

Related Capabilities Style

Question 28:	Please rank which style of "Related Capabilities" you prefer.						
Raw Score				Percentage			
A	B	C	No Resp.	A	B	C	No Resp.
11	14	6	0	35.48	45.16	19.35	0.00

Data in Table 29 indicate survey participants' preference regarding job title and employer information style. Eighteen employers (58.06%) preferred Resume A, 10 employers (32.26%) preferred Resume B, and 2 employers (6.45%) preferred Resume C. One employer (3.23%) did not respond to this question.

TABLE 29

Employer Information and Job Title Style

Question 30: Please rank which style job title and employer information you prefer with your most preferred style as number 1.

Raw Score				Percentage			
A	B	C	No Resp.	A	B	C	No Resp.
18	10	2	1	58.06	32.26	6.45	3.23

The data in Table 30 show the respondents' preference regarding dates of employment. Eighteen employers (58.06%) preferred Resume A, 12 employers (38.71%) preferred Resume B, and no employer (0%) preferred Resume C. One employer (3.23%) did not respond to this question. The reader should note that no employer preferred the dates being omitted from the resume.

TABLE 30

Dates of Employment Style

Question 31: Please rank which style you prefer regarding dates of employment.

Raw Score				Percentage			
A	B	C	No Resp.	A	B	C	No Resp.
18	12	0	1	58.06	38.71	0.00	3.23

Data in Table 31 indicate the reference style preferred by survey participants. Sixteen employers (51.61%) preferred Resume A, 5 employers (16.13%) preferred Resume B, and 7

employers (22.58%) preferred Resume C. Three employers (9.68%) did not respond to this question.

TABLE 31

Reference Style

Question 32: Please rank your preference of the three reference styles.

Raw Score A	B	C	No Resp.	Percentage A	B	C	No Resp.
16	5	7	3	51.61	16.13	22.58	9.68

Table 32 data show survey participants' over-all preference for resume style. Seventeen employers (54.84%) preferred Resume A, 11 employers (35.48%) preferred Resume B, and 1 employer (3.23%) preferred Resume C. Two employers (6.45%) did not respond to this question.

TABLE 32

Over-all Preference

Question 33: Please rank the attached resumes in order of your preference (A, B, C) with the most preferred as number 1.

Raw Score A	B	C	No Resp.	Percentage A	B	C	No Resp.
17	11	1	2	54.84	35.48	3.23	6.45

The data in Table 33 indicate the reaction to the three resume styles in regard to an interview invitation. Twenty-four employers (77.42%) would invite the applicant for an

interview based on Resume A, 3 employers (9.68%) would not invite the applicant based on Resume A, and 4 employers (12.90%) did not respond to this question. Twenty-four employers (77.42%) would invite the applicant for an interview based on Resume B, 3 employers (9.68%) would not invite the applicant based on Resume B, and 4 employers (12.90%) did not respond to this question. Seventeen employers (54.85%) would invite the applicant to an interview based on Resume C, 10 employers (32.26%) would not invite the applicant based on Resume C, and 4 employers (12.90%) did not respond to this question.

TABLE 33

Interview Invitation

Question 34: Would you invite the job applicant to a job interview based on:

Resume A			Percentage		
Yes	No	No Resp.	Yes	No	No Res
24	3	4	77.42	9.68	12.90
Resume B					
24	3	4	77.42	9.68	12.90
Resume C					
17	10	4	54.85	32.26	12.90

CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The purpose of this study was to identify the criteria an employer uses when reading a resume in determining which applicants will receive an interview invitation.

Thirty-one questionnaires were completed by personnel professionals representing major corporations, government agencies, and public schools who were attending career fairs in the Denver and Fort Collins, Colorado, vicinity. Because of personal contact a 100 percent response rate was obtained.

A large number of employers surveyed (48.38%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out if the objective was omitted from the resume, a fewer number (29.03%) would definitely or very likely screen an applicant out if he/she did not include a job objective on the resume. A smaller number (22.58%) would not use the job objective in the screening process.

The majority of survey participants (70.95%) indicated they would not or would seldom screen an applicant out if the G.P.A. was excluded from the resume, a few (16.13%) would very likely screen the applicant out, and a small number (12.90%) would not consider the G.P.A. in the screening process.

Over half the employers surveyed (67.74%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out if the G.P.A. was below a 3.0 on a 4.0 scale; however, a number of respondents (22.58%) indicated a low G.P.A. definitely or very likely would screen the applicant out. A small number (9.68%) would not consider a low G.P.A. in the screening process.

However, if the job applicant met all other requirements of the position, and a low or average G.P.A. could be legitimately explained, a majority of the employers (64.52%) would definitely or very likely screen the applicant in for an interview, a few survey participants (25.81%) would not consider a legitimately explained G.P.A. in the screening process, and a smaller number (9.68%) would not or seldom would not screen in an applicant based on this information.

It is interesting to note that, although the majority of survey respondents would not screen the applicant out if the G.P.A. was low or omitted, a clear majority would screen the applicant in if an average or low G.P.A. was adequately explained.

A majority of the employers surveyed (58.07%) would not or would seldom screen an applicant out if he/she was overqualified for the position; however, nearly two out of five employers (38.71%) definitely or very likely would screen an overqualified candidate out of the hiring process. A small number (3.23%) would not consider in the screening process the fact that an applicant was overqualified.

A clear majority of the survey participants (80.65%) would not or would seldom screen an applicant out if the candidate had extensive education in an unrelated field, a few (16.13%) would very likely screen the applicant out, and a small number (3.23%) would not consider extensive education in an unrelated field in the screening process.

Nearly three out of every four participants surveyed (74.20%) indicated they would definitely or very likely screen the applicant in for the interview based on work experience directly related to the position being filled. A smaller number (16.13%) would not consider directly related work experience, and a few (9.68%) would seldom screen the applicant in based on directly related work experience.

Over half the employers surveyed (61.29%) would not or would seldom screen an applicant in based on work experience unrelated to the position being filled, a smaller number (22.58%) would not consider unrelated work experience in the screening process, and a few (12.90%) would very likely screen the applicant in based on unrelated work experience.

The employers surveyed were evenly split on the question of gaps in employment history. Approximately 45 percent (45.16%) would definitely or very likely screen the applicant out if gaps in the employment history were evident, however, approximately 45 percent (45.16%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out based on employment gaps. A small number (9.68%) would not consider this information in the screening process.

A clear majority of the survey participants (87.09%) would definitely or very likely screen in an applicant who met all other requirements for the position and could legitimately explain employment history gaps, a small number (6.46%) would not or would seldom screen an applicant in if the gaps in employment history could be legitimately explained. A few (6.45%) would not consider this information in the screening process.

It is interesting to note that although employers were evenly split regarding employment history gaps as a reason to screen an applicant out of the hiring process, an overwhelming majority indicated legitimately explained gaps in employment history would screen the applicant in for the interview.

A majority of the employers surveyed (51.61%) would not or would seldom screen out based on prior employment of less than one year in length; however, nearly one out of three employers (32.26%) definitely would or very likely would screen the applicant out, a small number (12.90%) would not consider length of employment in the screening process. If the length of prior employment is from one to two years, an even larger majority of employers (67.75%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out, a smaller number (16.13%) definitely or very likely would screen out, a few (9.68%) would not consider this information in the screening process. When the length of prior employment is two to three years an even clearer majority of employers (83.87%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out, a small number (9.68%)

would not consider prior length of employment in the screening process, and no employer (0%) would screen an applicant out based on a prior employment length of two to three years.

Although a majority of the survey participants indicated they would not screen out based on short employment history, the number of employers who would not screen out rose as the length of prior employment rose.

Over four out of five employers surveyed (80.75%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out if the honors, awards, and memberships portion was omitted from the resume, a few (16.13%) would not consider the omission of this section in the screening process, and a small number (3.23%) would definitely screen the applicant out if the honors, awards, and memberships section was not included.

Well over half the survey participants (58.07%) indicated they definitely or very likely would screen the applicant in based on information provided in the honors, awards, and memberships section of the resume, a smaller number (22.58%) would not consider this information in the screening process, and a few (16.13%) would not or would seldom screen in based on information from this section.

It is interesting to note that even though a vast majority of the employers surveyed would not screen the applicant out if the honors, awards, and memberships section was omitted, well over half the respondents would use information from this section to screen the applicant in for the interview.

A large number of the employers surveyed (41.94%) indicated they would not consider information from the interests section in the screening process, a few employers (32.26%) would not or would seldom screen in, and a smaller number (22.58%) would definitely or very likely screen the applicant in for the interview based on the interests section.

A majority of survey respondents (54.84%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out if the phrase "Available upon Request" was used in the reference section, a smaller number (32.26%) would not consider this format in the screening process, and a few (12.90%) would very likely screen the applicant out if the "Available upon Request" format was used.

A large majority of the employers surveyed (74.19%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out if an unfamiliar or unusual resume style was used; however, nearly one out of four (22.58%) indicated they definitely or very likely would screen the applicant out. A small number (3.23%) would not consider the resume style in the screening process.

The reader should note that although only one out of four would screen the applicant out if an unusual style was used, a very small number indicated that they would not consider resume style in the screening process.

Nearly three out of five employers surveyed (58.07%) would definitely or very likely screen the applicant out if the resume contained a misspelled word or typographical error, a smaller number (35.48%) would not or would seldom screen

out, and a very few (3.23%) would not consider misspellings and typographical errors in the screening process.

A vast majority of the employers surveyed (90.32%) would definitely or very likely screen the applicant out if the resume contained poor grammar, only a few (9.68%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out, and no employer (0%) indicated that grammar was not considered in the screening process.

The results of the preceding two questions emphasizes the importance employers place on correct spelling and proper grammar.

Nearly four out of five survey respondents (77.42%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out if a resume was 1 to 1 1/2 pages in length, a smaller number (12.90%) would not consider resume length in the screening process, and a few (9.68%) would very likely screen the candidate out. If the resume was 2 to 2 1/2 pages in length, over 45 percent (45.16%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out; but over 40 percent (41.93%) definitely or very likely would screen the applicant out. A few (12.90%) would not consider the resume length in the screening process. If a candidate submitted a resume that was three pages in length, nearly half of the survey participants (48.39%) indicated they definitely or very likely would screen the applicant out, less than 40 percent (38.71%) would not or would seldom screen out, and a few (12.90%) would not consider resume length in the screening process.

It is interesting to note that as the length of the resume increases, the chances of being screened out of the hiring process also increases.

A clear majority of employers surveyed (64.51%) definitely or very likely would screen out an applicant that submitted a hand-written resume, a smaller number (32.26%) would not or would seldom screen out, and a very few (3.23%) would not consider the fact that the resume was handwritten in the screening process.

A vast number of survey respondents (80.65%) would not consider the color of paper used for the resume in the screening process, a few (9.68%) would definitely or very likely screen in based on colored paper, and the same number (9.68%) would not or would seldom screen in based on paper color.

Well over half the employers surveyed (67.75%) would not consider the color of paper in the screening process, and nearly 30 percent (29.03%) would not or would seldom screen out based on colored paper, a very few (3.23%) would definitely screen the applicant out if colored paper was used.

Over four out of five respondents (80.64%) preferred ivory or white paper for the resume, a smaller number (16.13%) had no paper color preference.

Nearly half the survey participants (48.39%) would not or would seldom screen the applicant out if a cover letter did not accompany the resume, a smaller number (29.04%) definitely or very likely would screen out, and a few (22.58%)

would not consider whether a cover letter accompanied the resume in the screening process.

A majority of the employers (54.84%) would definitely or very likely screen the applicant in based on the information given in a "Related Capabilities" section, a lesser number (25.81%) would not or would seldom screen in based on this information, and a few (12.90%) would not consider this section in the screening process.

The latter part of the questionnaire asked the survey participants to refer to sample resumes and indicate their most preferred choice. Sample A was a traditional, reverse chronological resume with side headings, dates at the left, and job titles underlined. Sample B was also a reverse chronological resume, but the main headings were centered, a related capabilities section was included, and the employer name was underlined. Sample C was a functional resume with main headings blocked at the left and related information slightly indented; major achievements was a major heading and the job title was underlined. Work history was a separate section listing only the employers' name, address, and the applicant's job title, no employment dates were given, and references were included on the resume.

The short, traditional job objective (Resume B) was most preferred (45.16%) by the respondents, the "what I can do for you" objective statement (Resume A) was ranked second (32.26%), and the "I" statement (Resume C) was least preferred (19.35%).

The blocked at the left heading style with the information block indented to the right (Resume A) was most preferred by the survey participants (48.39%), the centered style with the information centered under the heading (Resume B) was ranked second (41.94%), and the style with a blocked left heading and the information slightly indented under the heading (Resume C) was the least preferred style (9.68%).

The separate "Related Capabilities" section (Resume B) was most preferred by the respondents (45.16%), the style that incorporated related capabilities in the experience section as "responsibilities required:" (Resume A) ranked second (35.48%), and the resume with no related capabilities section included (Resume C) ranked last (19.35%).

The resume with the underlined job title first, followed by the employer information (Resume A) was preferred by the majority of the respondents (58.06%), the resume with underlined employer information, followed by the job title of the applicant (Resume B) was ranked second (32.26%), and the resume with the employer listed first and the job title following with no underlining, was ranked third (6.45%).

Dates of employment blocked in the left margin (Resume A) was ranked first by the majority of the respondents (58.06%), dates of employment following the employer information and job title as a part of the narrative (Resume B) ranked second (38.71%), and omitted dates of employment (Resume C) was least preferred (0%).

Over half the respondents (51.61%) ranked the reference "Available upon request" format (Resume A) first, a smaller number (22.58%) preferred the references listed on the resume (Resume C), and the phrase "See attached list" (Resume B) was least preferred (16.13%).

The traditional, reverse chronological style (Resume A) was ranked as most preferred by the survey participants (54.84%), the reverse chronological, centered resume style (Resume B), was ranked second (35.48%), and the functional style (Resume C) was least preferred (3.23%).

Over three out of four survey participants (77.42%) would invite the applicant for an interview based on Resume A or B. However, well over half the respondents (54.85%) would invite the applicant for an interview based on Resume C.

It is interesting to note that although the survey participants often preferred the style of Resume A over Resume B and Resume C, the respondents indicated by a large majority they would invite the applicant to the interview based on any of the three styles. The style of Resume A and B fared equally well; Resume C, although not receiving as a high ranking as Resume A and B, still ranked high with a majority of the respondents.

Conclusions

The following conclusions are drawn from the findings of this study:

1. The omission of the G.P.A. from the resume is not used as a criterion for screening the applicant out of the hiring process.

2. A low or average G.P.A. is not used as a criterion to screen the applicant out of the hiring process.

3. A legitimately explained low G.P.A. is a criterion used to screen the applicant in for the interview.

4 Extensive education in an unrelated field is not a criterion used to screen the applicant out of the hiring process.

5. Directly related work experience is a criterion used in the screening process.

6. Unrelated work experience is not a criterion used to screen the applicant in for an interview.

7. There was no clear evidence that employment history gaps were used as a criterion in the screening process. However, a legitimately explained employment history gap is a criterion for screening the applicant in for the interview.

8. It appears that prior employment length of less than one year is not used as a criterion to screen the applicant out of the hiring process. However, as the length of prior employment of the applicant increases, the number of employers who screen out based on length of prior employment decreases.

9. Omission of the awards, honors, and memberships section is not used as a criterion for screening the applicant out of the hiring process. However, employers use the

information from this section as a criterion to screen the applicant in for the interview.

10. An unusual or unfamiliar resume style is not used as a criterion to screen the applicant out of the hiring process. However, resume style is a criterion considered in the screening process.

11. Misspelling and poor grammar is a criterion used to screen the applicant out of the hiring process.

12. When a resume becomes two pages or longer in length it becomes a criterion used to screen the applicant out of the hiring process.

13. A hand-written resume is a criterion used to screen the applicant out of the hiring process.

14. Color of paper is not a criterion used to screen the applicant either in or out of the interview.

15. White or ivory paper is the most preferred by employers.

16. Employers use the information in a "Related Capabilities" as a criterion to screen the applicant in for the interview.

17. Employers prefer that employment history dates be included on the resume.

18. Employers prefer the traditional, reverse chronological resume style.

19. Employers do not use resume style as a criterion to screen the applicant out of the hiring process. The employer is most concerned with content rather than style.

Recommendations

Based upon the findings of this study, the following recommendations are made:

1. Teachers, counselors, and authors should stress the importance of resume content.

2. Teachers, counselors, and authors should stress the importance of correct spelling and proper grammar.

3. Additional research should be done to further identify and substantiate the criteria used by employers in the screening process.

REFERENCES

Allman, D. (1987). Job changing? your resume can make the difference. Data Management. 25, 20.

Anderson, W. (1984). The rhetoric of a resume. Viewpoints. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the College English Association, Clearwater Beach, FL. April 12-14, 1984.

Baxter, N. (1987). Resumes, Application forms, cover letters, & interviews. Occupational Outlook Quarterly. 31 1, 16-23.

Brinkerhoff, D., Smith, (1986). Write a resume, not an obituary. Training: the Magazine of Human Resources Development 23, p.37+.

Goodman, J. & et al. (1984). Opening doors. a practical guide for job hunting. Oakland University: Rochester, Mich. Continuum Center for Women.

Harkness, C. (1985). Jobs. how do I get there from here? Paper presented at the Annual Convention of the American Association for Counseling and Development, Houston, Tx, March 18-21, 1984.

Heenan, E. (1985). Finding, getting & keeping a job. Dutchess County Board of Cooperative Educational Services, Poughkeepsie, NY.

Helwig, A. (1985). Corporate recruiter preferences for 3 resume styles. Vocational Guidance Quarterly. 34 2, 99-105.

Longstreth, S. (1988). Evening Division Manager, Larimer County Voc-Tech Center, Fort Collins, CO. Personal Interview conducted March 15, 1988.

Mendenhall, T. & Murphy, J. (1984). Resumes: the quest for excellence. Professional Communications in the Modern World. Proceedings of the Southeast Convention of the American Business Communication Association, April 5-7, 1984.

Nivens, B. (1987). How to write a winning resume. Essence Magazine, 18, 114-5.

Perry, E. (1985). Resume makeover. Working Woman 10, 122+.

Rich, G. (1987). Careful! resumes speak louder than words. Business Education Forum. 41, 12+.

Rosen, E. (1988). Writing your own resume. Management Solutions 33 40+.

Rubin, H. (1987). One little resume and & how it grew. Working Women, 12, 100-04.

Ryland, K, Rosen, & Benson, (1987). Personnel professionals' reactions to chronological and functional resume formats. Career Development Quarterly. 35 3, 228-37.

Van Valkenburgh, N. (1985). The ABE student resume: an alternative to job applications. Lifelong Learning 9 3, 29-33.

Viering, D. (1987). How to survive the paper screening in a job search. NASSP Bulletin 71 503, 109-14.

Walbert, L. (1985). A foot in the door. Forbes 136, 240+.

Wenger, P. (1986). Communication strategies of employment assistance for college graduates. Paper presented at Annual Meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Atlantic City, NJ, April 30-May 3, 1986.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Cover Letter

Attached is a questionnaire concerning the resume as a tool in the screening process.

As a business teacher at Front Range Community College/Larimer County Center and private resume consultant, I am interested in how an employer determines which candidates to invite to the interview.

I am currently working on my Master's Degree in Vocational Education at Colorado State University. As part of my program, I am conducting a study to determine what criterion an employer uses to screen a job applicant in or out of the interview.

The information gained from this study should enable us to help job applicants present a clearer picture of themselves by teaching them to prepare a resume with relevant information in a style employers prefer.

All information provided by the questionnaire will be held in confidence as it pertains to a particular business.

If you would please take a few moments of your time to answer the questions on the enclosed questionnaire, it would be greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Carol Monthei

Enclosure

Appendix B

QUESTIONNAIRE

FIRM NAME _____

ADDRESS _____

Information from _____
(Signature and title)

Instructions: Please circle the appropriate answer.

JOB OBJECTIVE

1. If the job objective is omitted from the resume, how likely are you to screen the applicant out?

   1. Definitely Screen OUT
   2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
   3. Seldom Screens OUT
   4. Will Not Screen OUT
   5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

EDUCATION

2. If a job applicant does not include G.P.A. how likely are you to screen the applicant out?

   1. Definitely Screen OUT
   2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
   3. Seldom Screens OUT
   4. Will Not Screen OUT
   5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

3. If the job applicant includes G.P.A. and the G.P.A. is below a 3.0 on a 4.0 scale, how likely are you to screen the applicant out?

   1. Definitely Screen OUT
   2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
   3. Seldom Screens OUT
   4. Will Not Screen OUT
   5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

4. If the job applicant meets all other requirements of the position, how likely are you to screen the applicant in if an average or low GPA is explained (i.e., worked to finance education)?

   1. Definitely Screens IN
   2. Very Likely to Screen IN
   3. Seldom Screens IN
   4. Will Not Screen IN
   5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

Questionnaire
Page 2

5. How likely are you to screen out a job applicant who has more education than the position you are seeking to fill requires? (overqualified job applicant)

   1. Definitely Screen OUT
   2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
   3. Seldom Screens OUT
   4. Will Not Screen OUT
   5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

6. How likely are you to screen out a job applicant who fulfills all the requirements for the position you are seeking to fill but has extensive education in an unrelated field?

   1. Definitely Screen OUT
   2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
   3. Seldom Screens OUT
   4. Will Not Screen OUT
   5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

WORK EXPERIENCE

7. How important is work experience directly related to the position you are seeking to fill in determining whether to screen the applicant in for an interview?

   1. Definitely Screens IN
   2. Very Likely to Screen IN
   3. Seldom Screens IN
   4. Will Screen OUT
   5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

8. How important is work experience unrelated to the position you are seeking to fill in determining whether to screen the applicant in for an interview?

   1. Definitely Screens IN
   2. Very Likely to Screen IN
   3. Seldom Screens IN
   4. Will Screen OUT
   5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

9. How likely are you to screen out the job applicant if there are gaps in employment history?

   1. Definitely Screen OUT
   2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
   3. Seldom Screens OUT
   4. Will Not Screen OUT
   5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

Questionnaire
Page 3

10. If there are gaps in the employment history but the applicant meets all other job requirements, how likely is it the job applicant will be screened in if the gaps are legitimately explained (i.e., volunteer work, raising family)?

1. Definitely Screens IN
2. Very Likely to Screen IN
3. Seldom Screens IN
4. Will Not Screen IN
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

11. How likely are you to screen out the job applicant if length of prior employment is short?

A. Less than one year

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

B. One-two years

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

C. Two-three years

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

HONORS, AWARDS, MEMBERSHIPS

12. How likely are you to screen out the applicant if this section is excluded from the resume?

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

Questionnaire
Page 4

13. How likely are you to screen the applicant in from information provided in the honors, awards, or membership section?

1. Definitely Screens IN
2. Very Likely to Screen IN
3. Seldom Screens IN
4. Will Not Screen IN
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

INTERESTS

14. How likely are you to screen the applicant in using information from the "interests" section?

1. Definitely Screens IN
2. Very Likely to Screen IN
3. Seldom Screens IN
4. Will Not Screen IN
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

REFERENCES

15. How likely are you to screen the applicant out if "Available upon request" is used in the reference section?

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

STYLE, GRAMMAR, AND FORMAT

16. How likely are you to screen the job applicant out if the resume style is unfamiliar or unusual?

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

17. How likely are you to screen the job applicant out if the resume contains a misspelled word or typographical error?

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

Questionnaire
Page 5

18. How likely are you to screen the job applicant out if the resume contains poor grammar?

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

19. How likely are you to screen the applicant out if the resume is more than one page in length?

A. 1 1/2 to 2 pages

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

B. 2 to 2 1/2 pages

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

C. 3 pages

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

20. How likely are you to screen the job applicant out if the resume is handwritten?

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

21. How likely are you to screen the job applicant in if the resume is on colored paper?

1. Definitely Screens IN
2. Very Likely to Screen IN
3. Seldom Screens IN
4. Will Not Screen IN
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

Questionnaire
Page 6

22. How likely are you to screen the job applicant out if the resume is on colored paper?

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

23. Please list your 4 preferences for paper color with your most preferred color first.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

4. _____

24. Please list the colors of paper you dislike with your most disliked color first.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

25. How likely are you to screen the applicant out if a cover letter does not accompany the resume?

1. Definitely Screen OUT
2. Very Likely to Screen OUT
3. Seldom Screens OUT
4. Will Not Screen OUT
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

Questionnaire
Page 7

PLEASE REFER TO THE ACCOMPANYING RESUMES OF A POTENTIAL JOB APPLICANT WRITTEN IN THREE DIFFERENT STYLES TO ANSWER THE FOLLOWING QUESTIONS.

26. Please rank the most preferred job objective style in order of preference with your most preferred choice as number 1.

_____ Resume A _____ Resume B _____ Resume C

27. Please rank the most preferred heading style in order of preference.

_____ Resume A (Headings on side with related information blocked on the right)

_____ Resume B (Headings centered with related information directly beneath)

_____ Resume C (Headings at left with related information indented)

28. Please rank which style of "Related Capabilities" you prefer.

_____ Resume A (Listed as "responsibilities required" in experience section

_____ Resume B (Listed as a separate section under job objective.

_____ Resume C (no related capabilities listed)

29. How likely are you to screen the applicant in based on a "related capabilities" section?

1. Definitely Screens IN
2. Very Likely to Screen IN
3. Seldom Screens IN
4. Will Not Screen IN
5. Not Considered in the Screening Process

30. Please rank which style job title and employer information you prefer with your most preferred style as number 1.

_____ Resume A (Job title listed first and underlined with employer listed second.

_____ Resume B (Employer listed first and underlined with job title listed second)

_____ Resume C (Employer and job title listed in separate section from duties associated with the job)

Questionnaire
Page 8

31. Please rank which style you prefer regarding dates of employment.

_____ Resume A (Employment dates at left in margin)

_____ Resume B (Employment dates in the body following job title)

_____ Resume C (No employment dates)

32. Please rank your preference of the three reference styles.

_____ Resume A ("Available upon request")

_____ Resume B ("See Attached List")

_____ Resume C (References Listed)

33. Please rank the attached resumes in order of your preference (A, B, C) with the most preferred as number 1.

1. _____

2. _____

3. _____

34. Would you invite the job applicant to a job interview based on:

Resume A: Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

Resume B: Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

Resume C: Yes _____ No _____

Comments:

Please feel free to write any additional comments you feel are appropriate. Any information you give will be kept in confidence regarding the source of individual comments or information given in filling out this questionnaire.

Thank You

JANE DARBY
125 Smith Road
Fort Collins, CO 80526
Phone 555-3346

OBJECTIVE

Seeking a position with a progressive company with opportunity for advancement where I can contribute to the success of the company by utilizing my business experience and education.

EDUCATION

Colorado State University - 9/84 to present.
Major: **Marketing** Minor: **English**
Degree: Bachelor of Science
Expected Date of Graduation: December 1988
GPA: 3.0

Financed 75% of my education through loans, grants, and work study.

EXPERIENCE

Summer 1987

Photographer/Word Processor - National Jewish Center for Immunology and Respiratory Medicine, Denver, CO. Operated a PDP-11 computer to photograph files of cellular images. Developed, printed and mounted pictures for publication and posters. Also used a Micro Vax computer and WordStar for word processing functions.

Responsibilities required: Self discipline, willingness to learn new skills, and ability to work under pressure in order to meet deadlines.

Aug. 1985 to Dec. 1985

Field Supervisor - MacMillan Educational Company, New York. Managed, supervised, and transported group of five sales representatives over a four-state area.

Responsibilities required: Professional attitude, ability to motivate people, leadership skills, and great flexibility.

June 1985 to Dec. 1985

Sales Representative/Trainer - MacMillan Company, New York. Performed "cold calls" and direct selling of educational material. Kept records, conducted training sessions and traveled extensively.

Responsibilities required: Enthusiasm, self motivation and discipline, positive attitude, and ability to deal with people in a variety of situations. Promoted to Field Supervisor.

HONORS

Won a one-week all expense paid trip to London for being one of the top student sales representatives in the U.S.

MEMBERSHIPS

Marketing Club member. Colorado State University. Participated in annual CSU fund/College of Business Phonathon for two years.

INTERESTS

Reading, writing, jazz dancing, skiing and racquet sports.

REFERENCES

Available upon request.

SAMPLE B

JANE DARBY
125 Smith Road
Fort Collins, CO 80526
Phone 555-3346

OBJECTIVE

Marketing Representative

CAPABILITIES

* Self disciplined
* Willing to learn new skills
* Ability to motivate people
* Work well under pressure
* Professional attitude
* Leadership skills
* Flexible
* Positive Attitude

EDUCATION

Colorado State University - 9/84 to present.
Major: Marketing Minor: English
Degree: Bachelor of Science
Expected Date of Graduation: December 1988
GPA: 3.0

EXPERIENCE

National Jewish Center for Immunology and Respiratory Medicine, Denver, CO. Photographer/Word Processor - Summer 1987. Operated a PDP-11 computer to photograph files of cellular images. Developed, printed and mounted pictures for publication and posters. Also used a Micro Vax computer and WordStar for word processing functions.

MacMillan Educational Company, New York. Field Supervisor - 8/85 to 12/85. Managed, supervised, and transported group of five sales representatives over a four-state area.

MacMillan Educational Company, New York. Sales Representative/Trainer-6/85 to 12/85. Performed "cold calls" and direct selling of educational material. Kept records, conducted training sessions and traveled extensively. **Promoted to Field Supervisor**

HONORS

Won a one-week all expense paid trip to London for being one of the top student sales representatives in the U.S.

MEMBERSHIPS

Marketing Club member. Colorado State University. Participated in annual CSU fund/College of Business Phonathon for two years.

INTERESTS

Reading, writing, jazz dancing, skiing and racquet sports.

REFERENCES

See Attached List

SAMPLE C

JANE DARBY
125 Smith Road
Fort Collins, CO 80526
Phone 555-3346

75

OBJECTIVE

A marketing position with a progressive company where I can utilize my business experience and education.

EDUCATION

Colorado State University - 9/84 to present.
Major: **Marketing** Minor: **English**
Degree: Bachelor of Science
Expected Date of Graduation: December 1988
GPA: 3.0

MAJOR ACHIEVEMENTS

Photographer/Word Processor
Operated a PDP-11 computer to photograph files of cellular images.

Developed, printed and mounted pictures for publication and posters.

Used a Micro Vax computer and WordStar for word processing functions.

Field Supervisor
Managed, supervised, and transported group of five sales representatives over a four-state area.

Sales Representative/Trainer
Performed "cold calls" and direct selling of educational material.

Kept records, conducted training sessions and traveled extensively.

Promoted to Field Supervisor.

HONORS

Won a one-week all expense paid trip to London for being one of the top student sales representatives in the U.S.

EXPERIENCE

National Jewish Center for Immunology and Respiratory Medicine, Denver, Colorado. Photographer/Word Processor.

MacMillan Educational Company, New York, New York. Field Supervisor, Sales Representative/Trainer.

MEMBERSHIPS

Marketing Club member. Colorado State University. Participated in annual CSU fund/College of Business Phonathon for two years.

REFERENCES

John Doe	Sue Smith	Joe Blow
565 Macon Street	454 6th Street	34 2nd Street
Fort Collins CO 80521	Denver, CO 80425	Zion, MI 48493